

Dear Jim,

5/26/85

There were three packages in today's mail from you, two in legal-sized brown envelopes, the third letter-sized, white with green trim. One of the brown, the thinner one, had not been sealed well and the P.O. added brown paper tape. It included the DDE from a Bud case as related to new material released to Koch and "sent in separate package." Nothing of that description included. The second brown envelope is identified as from Allen v. DoD. There also was printed matter I've separated to read later today if I do not perk up or when walking in I do.

With regard to the Bud DD my attention was drawn to 1256-1036, p. 285 because from what is stated it could relate to Nosenko. The description is so general it could be of almost anything, but the reference to three FBI reports in connection with what is alleged makes me wonder if this relates to Nosenko, relating to whom there are three disclosed FBI reports. The could, for this as of that time, claim proper classification even though it was not proper if related to Nosenko.

In what was disclosed to Mark, thanks for saving me the time of flagging the clearest version of the ZRR file documents. I am guessing but I believe I've seen this before, perhaps with more excised. I do not recall and I draw your attention to the graf numbered 9, which asks "Should phony 201" be "forged and backdated" and filed. My reason for calling this to your attention is that you may be able to use disclosure of this practise in litigation and because you may from time to time wonder if what is disclosed is phony or forged.

In the Mark Allen disclosures if nobody has identified Doc No. 395-745, marked in hand lower-right D01316 (23) I wonder if it relates to what I got in the ex sess transcript about Oswald's alleged use of a Rotterdam apartment for three days. The descriptions is "related to the transit of Lee Harvey Oswald through a European country in 1962." I also think I recall some disclosures about him on a train, and I think as it went through Poland. I recall no other reference to that apartment use and, of course, the ex sess transcript could have been wrong. But there are not many agencies with spare apartments in foreign cities, but the CIA does have its safe houses.

Mark Lynch phoned last evening and we spoke briefly. I understand he will limit to justifying claim at this point, largely if not entirely LaHaie's hourly records. If he has any question about the question I raised, of addressing LaHaie's word and honesty from the record, what I had in mind is limited to using what he has stated in this litigation relating to the need for discovery, etc. Did you state on x/x/xx that... is that a truthful statement?

We discussed only briefly, without going into detail, whether they'll have to use the local courts to collect and my belief that I'm entitled to a trial, not just rubber-stamping of a decision not based on any trial or even statement of facts or finding of facts. I'd like to know more about this before I need to know.

Best,